

COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1983

A regular meeting of the College Township Council was called to order at 7:32 p.m. by Chairman Dargitz at the College Township Municipal Building.

Members present: Donald E. Bailey, Gale L. Dargitz - Chairman, J. Carroll Dean, Herbert W. Stewart, and Dolores A. Taricani

Others present: Manager C. Thomas Lechner
Treasurer Robert L. Hayden

OPEN DISCUSSION

None.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Minutes of the Regular Meeting held on January 13, 1983 and the Minutes of the Special Meeting for consideration of the 1983 BOCA Codes held on January 31, 1983 were approved as submitted. The Minutes of the Second Regular Meeting held on January 27, 1983 were approved with the following corrections:

Page 2, middle paragraph, "editorial changes to the Budget" was corrected to read "editorial changes to the Police Contract", and

Page 3, last paragraph, required the insertion of the words "agreement" and "Counties" in the description of Exhibit A ("...the agreement between Central Counties Bank and the Township that implements the Resolution").

MANAGER'S UPDATE

Manager Lechner reviewed for Council the items contained in his written Update. With regard to Item 5, clarification from the Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor on the necessity for Council taking a position on the Board's decision of the Ishler case, Taricani said that she had spoken with the Solicitor at both the Manager's and the Chairman's request. During this conversation, Taricani reported, she emphasized to the Solicitor that the Council had never before been asked, nor had ever offered, to take a stand on any of the Zoning Hearing Board's Decisions. The Solicitor seemed surprised, she noted, and indeed had some difficulty with this information, but agreed to proceed automatically with the Board's defense of its position.

Dean remarked that although Council was not formally taking a stand on the Board's decision, the Solicitor's request had been discussed at a previous meeting (January 13, 1983). He added that the Minutes of that meeting would stand as evidence that Council's lack of statement on the Board's decision did not constitute a lack of support for the decision or the Zoning Hearing Board in general.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Bailey questioned the large amount (\$10,030) listed under Miscellaneous Revenues in the Financial Report, noting that this figure exceeds the total expected receipts for the entire year. Lechner replied that this entry, which represents the funds received from the Township's Tax Anticipation Loan, was erroneously listed, and will be recategorized under Liabilities (Notes Payable).

With this correction being made, Bailey moved and Taricani seconded that the Financial Report be received as amended. The motion was carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

C-1. Centre Region Parks and Recreation Department. Chairman Dargitz summarized the contents of a letter received from Bob Ayer, Director of the Centre Regional Parks & Recreation Department, informing the Council that the Department of Community Affairs has reduced the maximum Parks Grant to \$30,000 to any one community. Since this is a Matching Grant Program, the total allowable expenditure for a project under this program would be limited to a cost of \$60,000.

Lechner noted that the program also stipulates a minimum expenditure of \$30,000 -- \$15,000 from the DCA and \$15,000 from the participating municipality. He added that the Township's share of funds for this project would not be needed until 1984.

Taricani said that the Township is not in the financial position to undertake any such program; there are more important projects awaiting the Township's attention. Stewart and Dean concurred, and Dargitz instructed the Manager to notify Bob Ayer that the consensus of Council is to take no action regarding this program.

C-2. Pennsylvania Fish Commission. Council is in receipt of a copy of a letter to the Centre Regional Parks & Recreation Department from the Pennsylvania Fish Commission confirming the latter's intentions to correct the streambank erosion problems at Spring Creek Park. As proposed, the project would entail no cost to, or labor output from, the Township and the Council was in agreement that the construction proceed.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Sign Ordinance and Zoning Ordinance. Ron Weis, Chairman of the College Township Planning Commission, had forwarded to Council the Centre Regional Planning Commission's proposed amendments to both the Township's Sign Ordinance and to the Zoning Ordinance.

Dargitz noted that the Council had held a work session on the Sign Ordinance on January 27, 1983, and that a Public Hearing on the revised Sign Ordinance is scheduled for March 10th. In preparation for that Public Hearing, he asked that Taricani, who has been working on the Sign Ordinance for many years, review the Commission's recommendations. Work on the Zoning Ordinance amendments, Dargitz added, would commence shortly after the March 10th Hearing.

Council Meeting
February 10, 1983
Page 3

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

P-1 Rallis Subdivision, Preliminary-Final Plan. Manager Lechner presented to Council the Preliminary-Final Plan for the Rallis Subdivision in lieu of the absent Dave Sweetland, Engineer for the Project. He noted that the Centre Regional Planning Commission had given the Subdivision "its blessing" and that the plan met all Township requirements.

Following a short review of the Subdivision Plan, it was moved by Dean and seconded by Bailey that Council approve the Preliminary-Final Plan of the Rallis Subdivision, dated December 4, 1982, last revised January 28, 1983. The motion was carried unanimously, and the requisite Council signatures were secured.

P-2 Spring Creek Estates, Phase VII, Preliminary Plan. A Sketch Plan of the entire Spring Creek Estates Development was presented to Council by Uni-Tec Engineer, Pat Ward. He outlined the parameters of Phase VII, the plans which were under consideration, and briefly reviewed the status of the preceding Phases. Ward also noted that a dispute between two property owners and the developer over the paving of a street had been settled by written agreement.

Stewart asked about the type of curbing to be installed, and wondered whether the individual property owner could request a specific ~~style of~~ ^{cat cut} driveway. Ward replied that a uniform "low profile curbing" was being installed throughout the Development and added that this type of curbing obviates the need for indented driveways. Both he and Lechner remarked that low profile curbing carries several advantages over other methods. No alterations could be made to the curbing by the homeowners, Lechner added, as, once dedicated, the curbing becomes the property of the Township.

There being no further discussion, Dargitz reported that the suggestions of the Planning Commission had been incorporated into the plans, and entertained a motion by Taricani that the Preliminary Plan for Phase VII of Spring Creek Estates, dated December 10, 1982, last revised February 4, 1983, be approved. Stewart seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

P-3 Spring Creek Estates, Phase VIII, Preliminary Plan. Pat Ward next presented to Council the Preliminary Plan for Phase VIII of Spring Creek Estates, delineating the parameters of that area on the overall Sketch Plan.

Lechner said that the Township Engineer, Dave Sweetland, had reviewed the plans; that all recommended changes had been made; and that the plans are in accordance with all Township requirements. He also noted that an effort had been made to resolve all problems before the plans are brought before Council, and commended Pat Ward for his cooperation.

Council Meeting
February 10, 1983
Page 4

Taricani likewise commended Lechner for his efforts, and seconded Dean's motion that Council approve the Preliminary Plan for Spring Creek Estates, Phase VIII, dated January 10, 1983, last revised February 7, 1983. The motion was carried unanimously.

BUSINESS

B-1 PennDOT Turnback Program. Manager Lechner informed Council that PennDOT had responded to his letter of January 5, 1983 in which he stated the Township's position in regard to the turnback of Branch Road and Pike Street.

In his letter of January 26, 1983, Thomas Ickes, a PennDOT District Engineer, expressed the Department's displeasure over the Township's refusal to accept the three bridges in that area as part of the turnback program. Citing a letter dated February 13, 1981 from then Chairman Taricani, he accused the Township of failing to honor its commitment to take over the bridges once certain Township-specified construction improvements were completed. He added that approximately \$108,000 had already been expended by the Department to widen the roadway, improve drainage, repair the three bridges, and upgrade guardrails on the approaches to these bridges. Further improvements -- overlaying the pavement and completion of the shoulders -- estimated at \$334,000, are tentatively scheduled for completion this summer. The Department had acted in "good faith" and had done everything possible to comply with the Township's specifications for improvement of these roads; he suggested the Township act accordingly and complete the resolutions necessary to initiate the formal legal agreement to transfer Pike Street and Branch Road to College Township "with due haste".

Lechner remained unmoved by Ickes' protests, and maintained his position that acceptance of the three bridges could be detrimental to the Township. The Township does not have to accept the bridges as part of the turnback program, he said, and the cost of bridge maintenance and repair could be too costly for the Township to handle. He added that any money received from the Liquid Fuels program would be insufficient to cover the bridges' maintenance costs.

Dargitz said that PennDOT had apparently misinterpreted Taricani's letter of February 13, 1981. Nowhere in that letter, he contends, does Taricani write that the Township will take over the three bridges. The letter does state that "upon completion of the construction and improvements indicated below (enumerating three), College Township will take over Branch Road and Pike Street and make them part of the Township road system."

Dargitz believed that PennDOT understood the letter to mean that once all those areas the Township specified to be improved, including the three bridges, were completed, they would all be accepted by the Township as part of the take-over. What the letter states, however, is that upon completion of all the specified work, with the repair of the bridges just one of the improvements to be made, the Township will take over the roads only. The letter, he said, is silent on the issue of the take-over of the bridges.

Council Meeting
February 10, 1983
Page 5

Dean concurred and remarked that "every letter has been silent on the issue of the bridges". He also mentioned that in every discussion with PennDOT over the turnback of the roads program, ~~the issues of acceptance of the roads, and acceptance of the bridges were always treated separately~~ ^{was mentioned} ~~was not mentioned~~.

Taricani agreed; had Council ever discussed the take-over of the bridges as part of the program, she would have been more concerned over the wording in her letter. The former Township Manager, upon whom she relied for much of her information, "knew his roads" and it was never his intent to accept the bridges.

Lechner noted that he had received word from PennDOT that should the Township not accept the three bridges as part of the turn-back program, the Department would forego the entire project. He further noted that the Township "could cross that bridge when it came to it".

Dean then raised the question of the acceptance of Pike Street, stating that in his two letters prior to Taricani's, no mention had been made that the Township would include that street as part of the take-over.

Dargitz said that the major problem remained the issue of the bridges, and the acceptance of Pike Street could be considered later. He then instructed Manager Lechner to respond to Ickes' letter and inform him of Council's interpretation of the Department's misinterpretation of the Township's intentions toward the turn-back program.

B-2 Signature for PennDOT Extension Agreement on South Atherton Street Bikeway. Because College Township had originally initiated contact with PennDOT on the South Atherton Street Bikeway, Lechner reported, the Department is requesting that the Township authorize an extension of time to the Engineer and contractor for the Bikeway's construction. He added that the extension would entail no further expenditures for the Township.

No formal motion by the Council was necessary and Dargitz signed the forms authorizing the extension on behalf of Council.

B-3 Appointment to the Centre Regional Senior Citizens Advisory Commission. Taricani's recommendation and motion and Dean's second for the appointment of Elvira Meyer as College Township's Representative to the Centre Regional Senior Citizens Advisory Commission was enthusiastically and unanimously approved by Council conditional upon her acceptance.

B-4 Industrial Development Authority -- Future IDA Loans. Dargitz informed Council that some changes in the State Law regarding Industrial Development Authorities (IDA) have resulted in new guidelines from the State Department of Commerce and revisions to the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982.

Council Meeting
February 10, 1983
Page 6

The Tax Act now provides, he said, that before Industrial Development Bonds are to be issued, they must be approved by the Government Unit on behalf of which the bonds are to be issued or by the applicable elected representative of such Governmental Unit, or by Voter Referendum after a public hearing has been advertised and held by the IDA. In other words, Dargitz explained, for those projects that are funded by the Township's IDA, the Council now has the opportunity to approve or disapprove of any loan before the bonds are issued.

Dargitz then suggested that rather than having one Council Member make such a decision individually, the issue be brought before the entire Council at one of the two regular monthly meetings. He further suggested that one Council Member be authorized to sign the approval on behalf of Council, consistent, of course, with the majority vote. The only draw-back to this method, Dargitz noted, might be one of timing -- i.e., that the IDA's final go-ahead would be delayed until Council could meet to discuss the loan's approval. He advised that the opinion of the Township Solicitor and a Member of the IDA be sought.

Taricani commented that since the Council is now meeting twice a month on a regular basis, there should be no undue delay.

Dargitz agreed that any problems of timing could always be worked out and appointed Donald Bailey to act as the Council's authorized signer.

B-5 Consideration of the Act 511 Tax Ordinances. A Public Hearing for the consideration of three Act 511 Tax Ordinances (a Mercantile License Tax Ordinance, an Amusement Devices Tax Ordinance, and a Franchise Fee on Cable TV Ordinance) was held on Monday, February 7, 1983. At that hearing, Dargitz stated, all three Ordinances were considered, for the most part, on a group basis. He suggested that for the purpose of this evening's consideration, each one of the Ordinances be addressed individually.

The Mercantile License Tax Ordinance, if adopted, would impose a .75 Mill levy on retail sales of goods, wares and merchandise and a .5 Mill levy on wholesale sales of goods, wares and merchandise to retail dealers. The first \$40,000 of gross sales per year would be exempt from the Tax, Dargitz stated, although a \$10 License would have to be obtained by all merchants (transients included), whether liable for the Tax or not. The Ordinance also requires that Tax Returns be filed quarterly, outlines the duties of the Tax Collector, and provides for fines and penalties for violations. Dargitz then invited the Council Members' comments.

Stewart declined to comment (at the Hearing he had stated that he was opposed to the tax).

Taricani stated that she had given the Tax a lot of thought and was very much affected by the presentations of the Township's merchants at the Public Hearing. She said that she sees many inequities in the Mercantile License Tax Ordinance as proposed; in particular the Ordinance's arbitrary imposition of a tax on merchandise only, excluding service income and all manufacturing.

Taricani also had difficulty with the Mercantile License Tax in that it taxes gross sales as opposed to net profits; in the case of some businesses, she noted, the gross sales can be enormous while the net profits can be almost nil.

Taricani concluded by saying that she could support some sort of overall tax on all businesses, but cannot lend her support in favor of the Mercantile License Tax Ordinance.

Bailey, on the other hand, supported the adoption of the Mercantile License Tax. Although he was not overly enthused about any of the Act 511 Taxes, and agreed that they were, in fact, "nuisance taxes", he felt that since the imposition of these taxes had been authorized through State legislation the Township should make use of them to provide those funds so necessary for the maintenance of services. He also suggested, as did Taricani, that Council and indeed all Township Residents approach their Pennsylvania State Representatives and urge that more equitable taxes be enacted.

In addition, Bailey noted his disagreement with the extra bookkeeping argument that many of the merchants presented at the Public Hearing. He stated that most of the records needed for compliance with the Mercantile License Tax would have to be kept for the purpose of filing State Income Taxes. (Dean and Taricani later concurred and both remarked that detailed record keeping is an essential part of sound business practices.)

Rather than placing the entire tax burden on the people who live in College Township, Bailey concluded he was in favor of broadening the tax base to include those people who use the Township's services but live outside.

Dean commented that he was essentially in agreement with Taricani in his inability to support the Mercantile License Tax Ordinance. Certain inequities in philosophy, in particular the exemption of all manufacturing, precludes his acceptance of the Ordinance as now written. He suggested that Council explore alternative approaches perhaps, "for all its faults", the Business Privilege Tax.

Dargitz noted that Council, should it desire to impose a tax on businesses, is limited to two choices: a Mercantile License Tax or a Business Privilege Tax. The only difference between them is that the latter tax also applies to services, such as dry cleaners, doctors, etc. The gross profit vs net profit issue cannot be addressed, he explained, because the Township does not have the power to tax net profits.

The only other revenue raising source left to the Township would be to increase next year's Real Estate Taxes, he added, which would not help the Township's 1983 financial problem.

Dargitz then voiced his support of the Mercantile License Tax Ordinance despite its faults. He felt that the revenues would ultimately come, not from the businessmen themselves, but from the customers instead, approximately 90% of whom do not live in the Township.

As with every tax, Dargitz added, the Mercantile License Tax is discriminatory. No tax is totally fair; the fairness issue may be an element that Council does not like but it is also one that Council cannot solve.

Projections for Township improvements were based, moreover, on the assumption that the additional \$40-50,000 these taxes are expected to generate would be forthcoming. Without this extra revenue, he said many important and necessary Township projects would have to be eliminated.

Additionally, Dargitz does not believe that the tax is so high as to make any one merchant non-competitive. He noted that the Township's Real Estate Tax is less than half that paid in the Borough of State College, giving the College Township merchant a significant advantage.

College Township has a high level of business activity, Dargitz stated, and Council should take advantage of the resources we have (as have many other municipalities throughout the State). "The Mercantile License Tax may not be pleasant", he added, "but it is appropriate to College Township".

In conclusion, while Dargitz does not really like the Mercantile License Tax ("I don't like the Real Estate Tax either."), he believes it to be preferable to continually falling back on the property owner via increased Real Estate Taxes.

The imposition of a Business Privilege Tax vis-a-vis the Mercantile License Tax was next discussed. The Business Privilege Tax, Dargitz reiterated, would impose a tax on services as well as goods. It can be levied one of two ways: as a Millage rate based on gross sales or as flat rate on all businesses, irrespective of sales. The latter method would be inappropriate, Dargitz noted, because it would tax the large retailers the same amount as the smaller independent merchants.

Dean said that he could "swallow" an across-the-board business tax on gross sales of goods and services. Even though the Township contains very few service concerns that could be taxed under the Business Privilege Tax, he feels that a tax on services as well as merchandise would remove at least one point of discrimination and dissention. He is less interested in the broadening of the tax base than the Business Privilege Tax would realize than he is in the removal of some of the inequities of the Mercantile License Tax.

Dargitz then suggested that Council approve the Mercantile License Tax and work toward the enactment of a tax on services as well. He noted that time is passing and that each month the Township does without this extra source of income revenues are lost and projects are delayed.

Dean replied that he would prefer to wait a while longer than to enact an inequitable tax. The value of a tax on businesses, he added, lies not so much in the immediate future but in the years ahead.

Taricani concurred and stated that unpleasant as it may be the Township may have to cut back on its projects and services for the current year. To her suggestion that the Council examine the possibilities of reassessing its Real Estate Tax to reflect a higher tax rate on Commercial properties, Dargitz replied that reassessment is not possible on a Township basis but can only be done County-wide.

Chris Exarchos, who attended the meeting, voiced his opposition to the Mercantile License Tax. He believed that the imposition of such a tax would have an adverse psychological impact on current and potential College Township merchants tending to drive businessmen out of and away from the area. He also differs with the Council in its assessment that the Township is doing non-residents a favor by allowing them to shop here. College Township merchants do not have a "corner on the market", he said; in fact, it is the other way around. The Township's sound commercial viability, he explained, is dependent upon a large and healthy consumer base. Businesses do have a fiscal responsibility to the Township, Exarchos admitted, but he urged Council to make use of that responsibility through other means.

Township Resident Frank Glenn, however, supported the Mercantile License Tax as it would force out-of-town vendors such as those who do business in the Nittany Mall, to pay toward those Township services from which they constantly benefit.

Dargitz agreed and remarked that while it is good to have a strong economic base most of the benefits of this strong commercial activity do not go to the Township residents. Relatively few Township residents are employed at the Mall, he noted, while those extra costs for police services and road maintenance that the Mall businesses require are borne by all the residents of the Township through their Real Estate Taxes. "Economic strength and growth do not come for free", he added.

All discussion concluded, Dargitz then outlined the options available with regard to passage of the Mercantile License Tax Ordinance. Council could (1) table the Ordinance or (2) entertain a motion to pass the Ordinance or (3) do nothing. Should the Council opt to table the Ordinance it could do so with the provision that the tax be modified to include business services as well as mercantile transactions.

Choosing option number one, Dean moved that Council table further consideration of the Mercantile License Tax Ordinance pending examination of the ramifications of a Business Use Tax patterned somewhat on the same scale. Taricani seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously.

Council next considered an Ordinance granting a franchise to Centre Video Corporation, its successors and assigns to construct, operate and maintain a cable television system in the Township of College, setting forth conditions accompanying the grant of the franchise, providing for Township regulations and for use of the cable television system. As proposed, this Ordinance would levy a 3% tax on those gross revenues received by the Cable TV Company from College Township customers. Dargitz noted that this Ordinance was essentially the same as the one passed by the State College Borough.

Council Meeting
February 10, 1983
Page 10

In addition, two representatives from the Centre Video Corporation were in attendance and they noted their acceptance of the Ordinance and its similarity to other Townships.

Dean then made a motion, which Taricani seconded, to approve this Ordinance. Before the vote was taken, however, he discovered that his comments and suggestions on the Ordinance which he had presented at the Public Hearing had not been incorporated. Adverse to sloppy and incomplete wording, he amended his motion to read that the Ordinance be approved with the addition of the phrase "including alpha numeric data signals" to Section I, Paragraph B-1, following the words "distributing by coaxial cable audio and/or visual radio, television, electronics or electronic signals"; and the addition of the phrase "or other legally cognizant regulatory agencies" wherever the Federal Communications Commission is mentioned. Taricani accepted these amendments to her second and the motion was carried unanimously.

The adoption of an Amusement Devices Tax Ordinance was next discussed. This Ordinance would provide for the levy of a tax on all amusement devices at the rate of \$50 per machine per year. Replacement machines would not be assessed an additional tax, Dargitz said, and noted that the Ordinance also outlined the duties of the Tax Collector and those fines and penalties to be assessed for violations. The Amusement Devices Tax Ordinance was also the subject of the February 7th Public Hearing, he added.

Bailey noted his uncertainty that the machines could adequately be policed for compliance with the Ordinance.

Dean replied that partial control could be imposed through a quota system but added that the problem of inventorying the machines was not his biggest objection. He was opposed to the imposition of an Amusement Devices Tax Ordinance because at the present time virtually only one concern -- Nittany Mall's The Barrel of Fun -- would be affected. Should another arcade-type amusement place open in the Township then he would support taking another look at the Tax.

Taricani also opposed the Amusement Devices Tax for much the same reasons as Dean. It bothered her that the tax would fall primarily on that one business, notwithstanding the fact that the Barrel of Fun is a National concern. To Dargitz's remark that Centre Video is the sole business to be taxed under the Franchise Fee Ordinance, she replied that while she is philosophically opposed to that tax also, "everybody else is doing it" and without that tax College Township is effectively subsidizing all the other Municipalities.

Dargitz had no other comments to add and summed up the Council's consensus that the members take no action on the Amusement Devices Tax Ordinance.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Stewart -- Public Services Committee -- noted that it was announced at the February meeting that the next month's meeting would include a discussion on a Regional police force.

Taricani -- Executive Committee -- said that the Agenda for the Committee's next meeting would include an update of the Senior Citizens Facility.

Dargitz -- Transportation Committee -- reported that it was recommended at the last meeting that a planner be hired for the MPO. Various road projects and bikeways were also discussed: the contracts for the construction of the improvements to Fox Hollow Road are due to be bid this April, with project completion scheduled for September; the South Atherton Street Bikeway is due to be bid in April; the Bypass from the Hospital to East College Avenue is to be bid in June as is the Park Avenue Extension.

Bailey wondered whether the speed limit had been reduced to 35 MPH on College Township's portion of Fox Hollow Road as had been recommended by Council. He was informed by Lechner that this has not yet been done, but Lechner will follow-up.

Dean -- Code Enforcement and Finance Committees -- said that neither of the two Committees had met for the month.

OTHER BUSINESS

Stewart said that he had witnessed many incidents of children "playing hookey from school" to play video games and other amusement devices. He agreed to Dargitz's suggestion that he work on an Ordinance prohibiting school-age children from playing video-type games during school hours.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dargitz informed Council that George Beatty had accepted with pleasure his appointment to the Environmental Advisory Council.

ADJOURNMENT

Taricani's motion and Dean's second for adjournment met with unanimous Council Members' approval at 9:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Thomas Lechner
Secretary

CTL:ss:bh

MANAGER'S UPDATE

COUNCIL MEETING - February 10, 1983

1. Notify Robert Ayer, Centre Regional Parks & Recreation Dept. Director, of Council's decision re application for Parks Grant from DCA. Concensus of Council was to take no action regarding this program due to financial situation.

Letter was sent on April 28, 1983

2. Reply to PA Fish Commission's letter requesting Township's permission for the Commission to correct streambank erosion in Spring Creek Park. Council was in agreement that the construction proceed.

Letter was sent 2/2/83 authorizing the Commission to assist

in fish habitat improvement work on that part of Spring Creek located in Spring Creek Park.

3. Respond to Tom Ickes' letter regarding Road Turnback program and inform him of Council's interpretation of the Township's intentions toward the turnback program.

Letter was sent on 2/14/83

4. Write letter to Elvira Meyer confirming her appointment by Council to the Centre Regional Senior Citizens Advisory Commission.

Letter of Confirmation was sent on 2/28/83

5. Follow-up on Council's request for reduction of Speed Limit on Township's portion of Fox Hollow Road from 40 MPH to 35 MPH.

Telephone conversation with Ron Turner, PennDOT, indicated the speed limit reduction had been approved and signs will be installed when available and when bikeway location has been designated.

ALSO ADDED NOTE: Speed Limit on West Branch Road has been reduced from 40 to 35 MPH, Signs have been installed, and he also thought NO PASSING signs have been installed along this road.